



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/540,461	03/31/2000	Charles J. Cohen	CYB-05902/03	2113
25006	7590	04/22/2004	EXAMINER	
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, PC 280 N OLD WOODARD AVE SUITE 400 BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			VU, THANH T	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2174	8	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/540,461	COHEN ET AL. <i>[Signature]</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thanh T. Vu	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment B, Filed 02/04/04.

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. In the Amendment B, claim 1 was amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the gesture-recognition modules". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4, 7-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being obvious over claims 1-10 of Cohen et al. ("Cohen", U.S. Pat. No. 6,681,031) in view of Nguyen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,072,494).

Claim 1 of Patent No. 6,681,031 to Cohen et al. is exactly the same to Claim 1 of the application except for the limitations designating one or more predefined behaviors; comparing the identified gesture to one of the predefined behaviors; and in the event of a correlation between the gesture and the particular predefined behavior, determining that the behavior of the target includes the particular gesture. However, Nguyen teaches designating one or more predefined behaviors (figs. 2 and 3; col. 2, lines 6-14); comparing the identified gesture to one of the predefined behaviors (figs 2 and 3; col. 2, lines 6-14 and lines 19-30; col. 7, lines 27-31); and in the event of a correlation between the gesture and the particular predefined behavior, determining that the behavior of the target includes the particular gesture (col. 5, lines 60-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Nguyen in the invention of Cohen because it provides a user a real-time gesture recognition system to perform any type of function that the computer was programmed to do upon recognition of the gesture.

The dependent claims correspond as follows:

The application	2	4	7	9	10	12	13	14
-----------------	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----

Cohen et al.	2	2	10	3	4	5	6	7
--------------	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---

The application	15	16
-----------------	----	----

Cohen et al.	8	9
--------------	---	---

Claim 3, Nguyen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the target is a group of people (col. 3, lines 15-21; It is inherent that a dynamic background might has more than one persons in it).

Claim 8, Nguyen teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the step of analyzing the gesture-making target includes imaging the target (fig. 2; col. 5, lines 48-51).

Claim 11, Nguyen teaches the method of claim 1, further including the steps of: receiving a file of recognized gestures along with their vector descriptions; and comparing the outputs of the gesture recognition modules to the vector descriptions (col. 7, lines 27-31).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being obvious over claim 1 of Cohen et al. ("Cohen", U.S. Pat. No. 6,681,031) in view of Nguyen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,072,494) and Freeman (U.S. Pat. No. 5,454,043).

Claim 5, Cohen and Nguyen teach the method of claim 1 as described above, but does not teach gesture-recognition modules output information relating to static and dynamic gestures. However, Freeman teaches gesture-recognition modules output information relating to static and dynamic gestures (fig. 1 and 2A; See abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Freeman in the invention of Cohen and Nguyen in order to provide static and dynamic hand gestures which give more flexibility for convenient computer control.

Claim 6, Freeman teaches the method of claim 5, further including the steps of: deriving the start position of the target, the end position of the target, and the velocity between the start and end positions (col. 3, lines 40-60); comparing the velocity of the target to a threshold value,

Art Unit: 2174

and identifying the gesture as a static gesture if the velocity is below the threshold value, otherwise, identifying the gesture as a dynamic gesture (col. 3, lines 31-38; col. 4, lines 25-30; col. 4, lines 50-56).

Claims 19-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being obvious over claim 1 of Cohen et al. ("Cohen", U.S. Pat. No. 6,681,031) in view of Nguyen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,072,494) and Qiao et al. ("Qiao", U.S. Pat. No. 6,075,895). The modified Cohen teaches the method of claim 1 as described above, but does not teach the target includes a robot, a weapon, or a vehicle. However, Quiao teaches the target includes a robot, a weapon, or a vehicle (col. 12, lines 23 –30; col. 12, lines 44-48; col. 1, lines 10-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include gesture-making targets as taught by Quiao in the modified invention of Cohen in order to provide various gesture-making targets which give more flexibility of computer control.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 17-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (703)-308-9119. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Vu
04/14/04

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100